

Kaplan 2000-0068

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Claims 1, 3 and 5-9 were also rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sasano et al, US Patent 5,200,994 in view of Van Gilluwe et al, US Patent 4,626,627. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sasano et al, US Patent 5,200,994 in view of Van Gilluwe et al, US Patent 4,626,627, and Cepelinski, US Patent 4,293,737.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 103 rejections. However, to overcome the 112 issue, and in the process to better claim the invention, claim 1 is effectively replaced with claim 10, and claims 3 and 7 are amended. It is believed that the claim amendments overcome the 35 USC 112 rejection.

Sasano et al describe an arrangement where a terminal instrument is connected to a digital network, and more specifically, to an ISDN line that contains "B" and "D" channels. The instrument includes a table 110 for storing identification data in the form of entries (tuples). Each entry comprises a sub-address and an associated name. This is the memory for called parties. Another table (111) also stores tuples of numbers and associates names, and this memory is for calling parties (sometimes referred to as caller parties). The instrument also includes circuitry for checking whether identification data on the incoming D channel that corresponds to sub-address data coincides with one of the plurality of sub-addresses previously stored in table 110, and if so, an alert is sounded and the name of the called party that corresponds to the received sub-address data is displayed. If there is no match, no alert is sounded. Additionally, the instrument includes circuitry for checking whether the identification data on the incoming D channel that corresponds to caller ID data coincides with one of the plurality of numbers previously stored in table 111, and if so, the associated name that is found in table 111 is displayed.

The only illustrations of the sub-addresses are found in FIG. 9, those being 1A, 1B, and 1C, (in Hexadecimal format), and those are not telephone numbers.

The Examiner asserts that at col. 4, lines 16-34 Sasano et al teach the step of determining whether to carry out a step of developing a called number ID. Although claim 1 is canceled, to explain the traversal of the 103 rejection and to demonstrate that the amendments were NOT done to overcome the presented art, applicant notes that what

Kaplan 2000-0068

the cited text addresses is the aforementioned memories of Sasano et al that contain called party and calling number information. The memory look-up that is performed in Sasano et al is not the same as the defined first step of claim 1 because it is performed within the CPE apparatus. In contradistinction, claim 1 specifies that a developed called number ID signal is applied to the line to which CPE is connected and that, effectively, specifies that the steps of determining and developing a called ID signal are performed outside the CPE equipment. Even if the Examiner were to argue that those steps could be performed within the CPE, it still remains that the signal developed by such steps is NOT sent to the line to which the CPE is connected. Therefore, the Examiner's citation does not teach the steps of claim 1. Further, the FSK modulation that is specified in claim 1 is of the called number ID signal, and Sasano does no such coding. It is not only that there is no FSK coding (which the Examiner admits), there is no coding at all, and there is certainly no coding to create a signal that is sent to the line to which CPE is connected.

As for claim 10, it clearly specifies a step of "querying a database, upstream from a customer premises to which said customer line extends," and Sasano et al clearly don't do that. Moreover, claim 10 specifies that the querying is "to determine whether more than one number translates to said customer line." Clearly Sasano et al also do not describe this. The Van Gilluwe et al reference is presented for its teachings of FSK modulation, but claim 10 has nothing to do with FSK modulation. Therefore, based on the first step of claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is not obvious in view of Sasano et al and Van Gilluwe et al combination.

The second step of claim 10 is also not obvious in view of the Sasano et al and Van Gilluwe et al combination. It specifies a step of coding a called telephone number, to form a called number ID signal that is sent (by the third step) to the customer line. Sasano et al do not perform such a step at all. The call comes in with a sub-field that specifies the called party. Aside from the fact that the sub-field is NOT a called telephone number, Sasano et al do not create it. Where, and how, this signal is created is not taught by Sasano et al. In fact, to applicant's knowledge no one has taught or suggested creating such a signal in response to a determination that more than one called number translates to a given customer line. Hence, applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is not obvious in view of the Sasano et al and Van Gilluwe et al combination.

Kaplan 2000-0068

The remaining claims depend on claim 10 and, therefore, are believed allowable.

It may be noted that claim 7 is amended to clarify that the directory in connection with whether the called number is accessible to everyone, or is unlisted, relates to the directory assistance database that callers access by dialing 411. It does not relate to the memory within a telephone instrument. There is no way that the memories of Sasano et al can be referred to as "directory-assistance database."

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Dated: 5/13/04

Respectfully,
Alan E. Kaplan

By 

Henry T. Brendzel

Reg. No. 26,844

Phone (973) 467-2025

Fax (973) 467-6589

email brendzel@comcast.net